

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks and arguments are respectfully requested.

The Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not sufficiently descriptive, and required a new title. In response, the current title has been deleted and substituted with a new title which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,569,072 (Roermund). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2 are patentable over Roermund for at least the following reasons.

Roermund is directed to a clock-controlled filtering arrangement for suppressing a number of interference frequencies related to a clock frequency. As shown in FIG 1A, a subtractor receives an input signal from an adder 6, and subtracts therefrom

the output of a comb filter 13, thus forming a negative feedback loop. The comb filter 13 is of the switched capacitor N-path filter type.

It is respectfully submitted that Roermund does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 2 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a memory loop fed with a periodic signal of period  $NT$  and in which the memory size of  $N/2$  memory elements, the feedback connection is negative and a factor of  $-1/2$  is provided at the output of the memory loop, wherein  $N$  is an integer and  $T$  is period of time.


These features are nowhere taught or suggested in Roermund. For example, Roermund is completely silent about a memory size of  $N/2$  memory elements. Rather, Roermund merely teaches an N-path filter. Further, Roermund is completely silent about a factor of  $-1/2$  provided at the output of the memory loop, as recited in independent claims 1-2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1-2 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or

averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
April 9, 2007

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101